



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,915	10/30/2003	Janani Janakiraman	AUS920030756US1	9641
35525	7590	03/23/2009	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA)			WU, RUTAO	
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC				
P.O. BOX 802333			ART UNIT	
DALLAS, TX 75380			PAPER NUMBER	
			3628	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			03/23/2009	
			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. In response filed December 17 2008, the applicant amended claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 25 and 26. No new claims have been introduced. Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14, 15, 19-23, 25, 26 and 28 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 9, filed December 17 2008, with respect to claims 1, 14 and 25 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. §112 1st paragraph rejection of claims 1, 14 and 25 has been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments, see page 9, filed December 17 2008, with respect to claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 25 and 26 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. §112 2nd paragraph rejection of claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 25 and 26 has been withdrawn.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 8-12, 14, 15, 19-23, 25, 26 and 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3628

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 8-11, 14-15, 19-22, 25-26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nassar, European Patent Application No. EP 1096405 A2 in view of Anderson et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0178226 in view of Lee et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,263,358 and further in view of Bekkers, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0019509 and in view of Maycotte et al., U.S. Pub No. 2004/0039613.

7. **As per claims 1, 14, and 25**, Nassar discloses a method, a system, and a computer program product (Nassar: Fig.1; col. 2, lines 7-11; col. 6, lines 16-17) for rescheduling travel arrangements comprising the steps of:

obtaining, by the dynamic itinerary monitoring system (Nassar: Fig. 1, "16"), current travel information for a user to identify a current status of travel of the user (Nassar: col. 3, lines 5-22 and 43-47; col. 6, lines 20-23);

responsive to a real-time change in status in at least one segment of a prearranged travel plan for the user, determining by the dynamic itinerary monitoring system whether the user has provided information for making changes to downstream segments of the prearranged travel plan (Nassar: col. 3, lines 52-53; col. 7, lines 5-37, "profile of his personal preferences");

automatically altering, by the dynamic itinerary monitoring system, the downstream segments of the prearranged travel plan according to the rule set; (Nassar: col. 2, lines 35-40; col. 6, lines 6-12 and 27-30);

automatically contacting, by the dynamic itinerary monitoring system, at least one agency computing device to modify travel accommodations associated with the travel

Art Unit: 3628

plan in accordance with the altered downstream segments (Nassar: Fig. 1, "14"; col. 6, lines 27-43; The TIC application server 16 contacts the content gateway 14 when accessing reservation module 12c. The Examiner notes, while Nassar discloses that the TIC application server 16, content gateway 14, and reservation module 12c typically run on a single computer, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have separated the TIC application server 16 from content gateway 14 into a second computer for the advantage of freeing up memory and making the first computer system less complex. Nassar does not teach altering the downstream segments of the travel plan without involvement of the user. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method and system of Nassar to have included altering the downstream segments of the travel plan without involvement of the user for the advantage of saving time and minimizing the work required by the user to reschedule a flight.); and

 sending a notification to a communication device associated with the user indicating the altered downstream segments of the travel plan and the modified travel accommodations (Nassar: Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 9-12; col. 11, lines 1-15).

 Nassar does not expressly disclose that the notification include both (i) changes that were made to certain of the downstream segments of the prearranged travel plan by the dynamic itinerary monitoring system, and (ii) new travel accommodation that were secured for the user by the dynamic itinerary monitoring system.

However, Maycotte et al disclose a system of dynamically monitoring a travelers reservation data, and if any disruption is found or anticipated then automatically booking alternate travel solutions for the travelers,[0036], [0040] and wherein the traveler receives a notification indicating the traveler of the flight cancellation and the subsequent re-booking on another airline just 30 minutes after the traveler's original departure time. [0010]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Nassar to include in the notification to travelers both specifically the changes that were made to certain of the downstream segments of the prearranged travel plan by the dynamic itinerary monitoring system and (ii) new travel accommodation that were secured for the user by the dynamic itinerary monitoring system since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

8. Nassar does not disclose a rule set wherein the rule set includes time-related information indicating under what conditions a discrepancy between the prearranged travel plan and the current travel information is to be resolved by altering downstream segments of the prearranged travel plan; wherein the rule set further includes information indicating a manner by which the discrepancy is to be resolved; and wherein automatically contacting at least one agency computing device to modify travel accommodations associated with the travel plan includes negotiating with the at least

Art Unit: 3628

one agency computing device to obtain new travel accommodations and applying user established preferences to the negotiation with the at least one agency computing device, such negotiation occurring without involvement of the user.

9. Anderson discloses a rule set wherein the rule set includes information indicating under what conditions a discrepancy between the prearranged travel plan and the current travel information is to be resolved by altering downstream segments of the prearranged travel plan (Anderson: paragraphs 0017; 0029) and wherein the rule set further includes information indicating a manner by which the discrepancy is to be resolved (Anderson: paragraphs 0017; 0020; 0029).

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method, system, and computer product of Nassar to have included a rule set wherein the rule set includes information indicating under what conditions a discrepancy between the prearranged travel plan and the current travel information is to be resolved by altering downstream segments of the prearranged travel plan and wherein the rule set further includes information indicating a manner by which the discrepancy is to be resolved as disclosed by Anderson for the advantage of automatically altering a reservation that the user would not have wanted to be bothered with (Anderson: paragraph 0032).

11. Nassar in view of Anderson does not disclose time related information and wherein automatically contacting at least one agency computing device to modify travel accommodations associated with the travel plan includes negotiating with the at least one agency computing device to obtain new travel accommodations and applying user

Art Unit: 3628

established preferences to the negotiation with the at least one agency computing device, such negotiation occurring without involvement of the user.

12. Lee discloses in a travel management application, a software agent (dynamic itinerary monitoring system) that acts autonomously on behalf of a user to negotiate with another agent (agency computing device) using user established preferences (Lee: col. 1, lines 8-15; col. 2, lines 43-46; col. 9, lines 13-19; col. 45, lines 22-30).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method, system, and computer product of Nassar in view of Anderson to have included wherein automatically contacting at least one agency computing device to modify travel accommodations associated with the travel plan includes negotiating with the at least one agency computing device to obtain new travel accommodations and applying user established preferences to the negotiation with the at least one agency computing device, such negotiation occurring without involvement of the user as disclosed by Lee for the advantage of finding the best travel deal for a customer without his/her involvement.

14. Nassar in view of Anderson and further in view of Lee does not disclose time-related information.

15. Bekkers discloses time-related information (Bekkers: paragraph 0059, "tolerance (the number of minutes delayed that constitutes a delay in the view of the particular customer)).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method, system, and computer product of

Art Unit: 3628

Nassar in view of Anderson and further in view of Lee to have included time-related information as disclosed by Bekkers for the advantage of creating specific user preferences that can help cater goods and services that fit a customer's demand.

17. **As per claims 2, 15, and 26**, Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers discloses the method, system, and computer product of claims 1, 14, and 25 as described above. Nassar further discloses retrieving the prearranged travel plan from a storage device (Nassar: Figure 1, "10"; col. 6, lines 16-30); and comparing the prearranged travel plan to the current travel information, wherein the real-time change in status in the at least one segment of the prearranged travel plan is determined. (Nassar: col. 3, lines 5-14; col. 6, lines 16-30).

18. **As per claims 3**, Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers discloses the method of claim 1 as described above. Nassar further discloses the prearranged travel plan is obtained as travel arrangements are finalized by the user via at least one web site (Nassar: Fig. 1, "20a"; col. 7, lines 5-26).

19. **As per claim 4**, Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers discloses the method of claim 1 as described above. Nassar further discloses the prearranged travel plan is obtained by receiving user input to at least one Web form provided by at least one server, identifying information regarding segments of the prearranged travel plan (Nassar: Fig. 1, "16" and "20a"; col. 7, lines 5-26).

20. **As per claims 8 and 19**, Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers discloses the method and system of claims 1 and 14 as described above. Nassar further discloses the user established preferences indicate a user

Art Unit: 3628

preference regarding at least one of a preferred type of travel accommodation (Nassar: col. 3, lines 52-54; col. 7, lines 8-10). Nassar does not disclose a preferred vendor of a travel accommodation.

21. Anderson discloses a preferred vendor of a travel accommodation (Anderson paragraph 0015, “e-commerce providers that a user prefers”).

22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method and system of Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers to have included a preferred vendor of a travel accommodation as disclosed by Anderson for the advantage of allowing a customer to select a particular service that is desired.

23. **As per claims 9, 20, and 28**, Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers discloses the method, system, and computer product of claims 1, 14, and 25. Nassar further discloses identifying a plurality of prearranged travel plans for a plurality of users in a travel plan storage device (Nassar: Figure 1, “10”; col. 2, lines 7-18; col. 4, lines 12-14); for each prearranged travel plan, determining if the travel plan is currently active (Nassar: Figure 1; col. 6, lines 16-30; The notification module 12b performs the task of determining if the travel plan is currently active when monitoring a specific event.); and performing the steps of obtaining, determining, altering and contacting for each currently active prearranged travel plan in the travel plan storage device (Nassar: Fig. 1, “10”; col. 2, lines 35-40; col. 3, lines 5-22, 43-47, and 52-53; col. 6, lines 6-12 and 20-43; col. 7, lines 5-37).

Art Unit: 3628

24. **As per claims 10 and 21**, Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers discloses the method and system of claims 1 and 14 as described above. Nassar further discloses the current travel information is obtained from at least one current travel information source computing device (Nassar: col. 2, lines 11-15; col. 3, lines 5-9).

25. **As per claims 11 and 22**, Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers discloses the method and system of claims 10 and 21 as described above. Nassar further discloses the at least one current travel information source computing device includes at least one of an airline computing system, a travel agency computing system, a transportation provider computing system, a lodging provider computing system, and a government agency computing system (Nassar: col. 2, lines 11-18).

26. Claims 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nassar, European Patent Application No. EP 1096405 A2 in view of Anderson et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0178226 in view of Lee et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,263,358 in view of Bekkers, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0019509 in view of Maycotte et al and further in view of Zobell et al., U.S. Patent No., 6,606,553.

27. **As per claims 12 and 23**, Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers discloses the method and system of claims 10 and 21 as described above.

Art Unit: 3628

28. Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers does not disclose the at least one current travel information source includes an Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) computing system.

29. Zobell discloses the at least one current travel information source includes an Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) computing system (Zobell: col. 12, lines 35-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the method and system of Nassar in view of Anderson in view of Lee and further in view of Bekkers to have included the at least one current travel information source includes an Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) computing system as disclosed by Zobell for the advantage of providing a method and system for effective weather rerouting decision support based on frequently updated weather forecasts (Zobell: col. 3, lines 15-19).

Conclusion

30. Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant, in preparing the responses, fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROB WU whose telephone number is (571)272-3136. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on (571)272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 3628

/John W Hayes/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628